

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed October 10, 2006, the Examiner has acknowledged the withdrawal of Claim 15, and has objected to Claim 1 due to a minor informality. Further, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-14 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a). By this paper, Claims 1, 5, 17, and 18 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention, and Claims 4, 7, 19, and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice. For the reasons set forth below Applicant respectfully submits that the amended Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-18 are patentably distinct from the prior art and should now be allowed.

Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner contends that the exact meaning of the term “high temperature nickel” in Claim 1 is not clear, and the term “cured thermoplastic polymer” in Claims 17 and 18 does not have sufficient antecedent basis. On Page 6, lines 15-20 of the Specification as originally filed, Applicant has clearly and specifically defined the meaning of the term “high temperature nickel”. It is submitted that such definition is sufficient for a clear and exact meaning of such term. With regard to Claims 17 and 18, the dependency has been amended by this paper in such a manner that the term “cured thermoplastic polymer” now has proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, it is considered that this rejection is no longer proper and should now be removed.

Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admitted prior art in view of Weber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,750,100). After reviewing the prior art, Applicant concludes that the invention to which they are entitled is broader than that covered in the Jepson Claims 19, 20. Accordingly such claims, and all similar references in the Specification, have been cancelled. It is respectfully submitted that Applicant’s invention is now entitled to the scope covered in Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 16-18 as amended. As to the Weber et al. reference, such reference describes a nickel shell mounted on a mold insert where the shell and the mold insert are of substantially the same coefficient of thermal expansion. The nickel material described in the Weber et

al. reference is listed in the Table 1 on Page 12 as “Nickel (electroforming)” and noted to exhibit significantly less desirable properties than the high temperature nickel of Applicants invention. Moreover, as now specifically disclosed in the Specification, the invention relates to thermal expansion of the machine mandrel greater than that of the sleeve (Page 7, Line 5-6). This important aspect of Applicant’s invention is not shown or in any way taught by Weber, et al. or any other art known to Applicant. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claim 1, and Claims 2, 3, 5-14, and 16-18 dependent thereon, which are the claims remaining in this Application, patentably define over the prior art, and should now be allowed.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

This Application is now believed to be in condition for favorable reconsideration and early allowance, and such actions are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company, Deposit Account No. 05-0225.

A duplicate copy of this request is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Lawrence P. Kessler
Registration No. 24,637

LPK:cvn
Attachment(s)
Telephone No. (585) 253-0123
Facsimile No. (585) 477-4646